



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/611,463	07/07/2000	Eugene Amdur	DSC-002	6431

7733 7590 09/28/2005

WALKER & JOCKE, L.P.A.  
231 SOUTH BROADWAY STREET  
MEDINA, OH 44256

EXAMINER
----------

TRAN, ELLEN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/611,463

Applicant(s)

AMDUR ET AL.

Examiner

Ellen C. Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to communication: amendment filed 15 July 2005 with recognition of a filing date of 7 July 2000.
2. Claims 5-11 are currently pending in this application. Claim 5 is an independent claim.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5-11 have been considered but they are not found persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument beginning on page 3, "Pending Claims 5-11 are not anticipated by Schneider ... The interface defined by claim 5 is not merely to allow a user to "find and access resources" (col. 25, line 26) as disclosed in the Schneider reference. Rather, the "user interface" recited in claim 5 permits a user to use the web-based component to set access policies". The Office disagrees with argument, Schneider teaches the "web-based" to set access policies accessible to users as indicated in previous Office Action as well as below in col. 25, lines 12-65. Note in lines 19-22 "In other embodiments, the IntraMap may take the sensitivity level of the resource and the trust level of the user's identification into account as well. The IntraMap interface is implemented by means of a Java<sup>TM</sup> applet that runs on any Java-equipped World Wide Web browser". This trust level is further explained in the reference that the user may act as an administrator see col. 31, lines 17-67.

With respect to applicant's argument on page 4, "There is no teaching or suggestion in the Schneider reference that a web-based tool made available to allow policy managers to permit users to define access policies for the network. Further Schneider teaches away from the structure recited in claim 5 by teaching that the users must send an e-mail to an administrator

Art Unit: 2134

when they wish to have access to a particular resource”. The Office disagrees with argument Schneider teaches that users can act as administrators and that this administration can be done for the network or the web see col. 31, lines 17-67. Note the table shown in FIG. 16 indicates user can be policy administrators as well as in col. 35, lines 49-67 “If an access filter 203 is being used by an administrator to modify access control database 301, then it will additionally have at least one working database (WDB) 1903. The working database is a copy of the database that is not being used to control access and therefore can be modified by the administrator. The administrator does so using a workstation or PC connected via a network to the access filter. The workstation or PC displays the administrative graphical user interface described above, and the administrator uses the GUI to make the changes as enabled by administrative policies. The changes may affect any aspect of the information stored in access control database 301. As indicated above, where the changes are changes in access or administrative policies, the administrator can use the policy evaluation feature to see the effect of the changes. When the administrator is satisfied with the changes, he or she clicks on the apply button and the changes are distributed to all of the access filters and incorporated into each access filter's live database”.

With respect to applicant's argument on page 5, “Claim 5 recites that there are “policy manages” who have access to “a policy builder component” and that a different set of “users” are given access to the “web-based administration component”. The capacity to provide a web-based administration component to users (as opposed to policy managers associated with the network itself) is neither taught nor suggested in the Schneider reference”. The Office disagrees with argument Schneider shows that users can be designated administrator and therefore have

Art Unit: 2134

access to policy management via the network see col. 25, lines 12-65, col. 31, lines 17-67, and col. col. 35, lines 19-47.

With respect to applicant's argument on page 5, "it is further respectfully submitted that the Schneider reference does not disclose or suggest an interface displaying a grid with nodes laid out on axes, as is recited in the claim". The Office disagrees as shown in the reference col. 35, lines 55-60 "The workstation or PC displays the administrative graphical user interface described above, and the administrator uses the GUI to make the changes as enabled by administrative policies." Note a GUI has two axes, the alignment of objects to an axis is well known in the art when designing computer programs to be displayed on a computer screen. In addition it is also well known in the art there are many different ways to represent information. Take for example your typical Excel spreadsheet, the program itself allows the user to decide which axis is x and which is y as well as what information to be displayed. Therefore any argument applicant directs toward how information is displayed relative to axes is not persuasive. The Schneider was used in this application because it clearly shows policy management with a group of users and administrators which can be modified over a network.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language

5. **Claims 5-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneider et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,178,505 (hereinafter '505).

As to independent claim 5, **"A computer security service for a computer network accessible by users and comprising services and resources, the computer security service comprising"** is taught in '505 col. 7, line 59 through col. 8, line 15;

**"a policy builder component available to one or more policy managers for defining access policies for the computer network users, services and resources, and"** is shown in col. 8, line 60 through col. 9, line 10;

**"a web-based delegated administration component accessible to users"** is disclosed in '505 col. 25, lines 12-65;

**"for defining access policies for the computer network users, services and resources the delegated administration component comprising a graphical user interface available to users for defining said access policies"** is taught in '505 col. 23, lines 15-65.

As to dependent claim 6, **"in which the delegated administration component is implemented as a service supported by the computer security service"** is shown in '505 col. 25, lines 12-18.

As to dependent claim 7, **"in which the graphical user interface comprises one or more HTML format pages accessible to users"** is disclosed in '505 col. 25, lines 23-40.

As to dependent claim 8, **"further comprising a delegated administration definition component for defining delegated administration permissions for users whereby users are selectively enabled to use the delegated administration component to define access policies for specified resources and users"** is taught in '505 col. 31, line 17 through col. 32, line 8.

As to dependent claim 9, “in which the delegated administration definition component further comprises a graphical user interface for displaying a grid having nodes, laid out on a first axis and on a second axis, each node corresponding to a variable set of users, potentially including the null set, for which delegated administration permissions are granted, the position of each node relative to the first and second axes in the grid defining the users and the resources, respectively, for which permissions are granted for the node” is shown in ‘505 col. 31, lines 17-32.

As to dependent claim 10, “the graphical user interface further comprising an array of nodes relative to the second axis for defining specified users enabled to modify user data maintained by the computer security service, the position of each node in the array of nodes, relative to the first axis, defining the user data for which the modification of data is enabled” is disclosed in ‘505 col. 31, lines 17-32.

As to dependent claim 11, this claim is directed to a computer readable program code of the computer security service of the above claims and is rejected along the same rationale.

### *Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In

no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen C Tran whose telephone number is

(571) 272-3842. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:00 am to 2:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ellen Tran  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2134  
20 September 2005



GREGORY MORSE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100